

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 18-1668V

UNPUBLISHED

DAWN HALLEY,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: April 28, 2020

Special Processing Unit (SPU);
Ruling on Entitlement; Uncontested;
Table Injury; Influenza (Flu) Vaccine;
Shoulder Injury Related to Vaccine
Administration (SIRVA)

Bridget Candace McCullough, Muller Brazil, LLP, Dresher, PA, for petitioner.

Mark Hellie, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for respondent.

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

On October 29, 2018, Dawn Halley filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*,² (the “Vaccine Act”). Petitioner alleges that as a result of an influenza (“flu”) vaccine that was administered on October 15, 2016, she suffered a left Shoulder Injury Related to Vaccine Administration (SIRVA). Petition at 1. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

On April 27, 2020, Respondent filed his Rule 4(c) report in which he states that he does not contest that Petitioner is entitled to compensation in this case. Respondent’s Rule 4(c) Report at 1. Specifically, Respondent states that “[m]edical

¹ Because this unpublished ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims’ website in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the ruling will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

² National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all “§” references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

personnel at the Division of Injury Compensation Programs, Department of Health and Human Services (“DICP”), have reviewed the petition and medical records filed in the case.” *Id.* at 4. Furthermore, it is “respondent’s position that petitioner has satisfied the criteria set forth in the Vaccine Injury Table (“Table”) and the Qualifications and Aids to Interpretation (“QAI”).” *Id.*

In view of Respondent’s position and the evidence of record, I find that Petitioner is entitled to compensation.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Brian H. Corcoran

Brian H. Corcoran
Chief Special Master